```
1
      Joseph M. Alioto
      ALIOTO LAW FIRM
2
      One Embarcadero Center
      Suite 4000
3
      San Francisco, CA 94111-3607
      Telephone
                    :(415) 434-8900
4
      Daniel R. Shulman, Pro Hac Vice
5
      Terry M. Walcott, <u>Pro Hac Vice</u>
SHULMAN, WALCOTT & SHULMAN, P.A.
6
      121 West Franklin Avenue
      Minneapolis, MN 55404
7
                    :(612) <del>874</del> <u>871</u>-2909
      Telephone
8
      John H. Boone
      LAW OFFICE OF JOHN H. BOONE
9
      One Embarcadero Center
      Fortieth Floor
10
      San Francisco, CA 94111
                    :(415) 434-1133
      Telephone
11
      Thomas P. Bleau
12
      BLEAU, FOX & ASSOCIATES
      3575 Cahuenga Blvd., West, Suite 580
13
      Los Angeles, CA 90068
      Telephone
                    :(323) 874-8613
14
      Attorneys for Plaintiffs
15
```

17

18

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 FOUAD N. DAGHER; BISHARAT **CLASS ACTION** 20 ENTERPRISES, INC.; ALFRED BUCZKOWSKI; ESEQUIEL DELGADO; **CASE NO:** CV-99-06114 GHK (JWJx) 21 MAHWASH FARZANEH; NASSER 22 EL-RADI; G.G.&R. PETROLEUM, INC.; FIRST-SECOND AMENDED **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND** H.J.F. INC.; KALECO, CO.; 23 MIKE M. MADANI; CARLOS MARQUEZ; INJUNCTIVE RELIEF UNDER THE SAMI MERHI; EDGARDO R. PARUNGAO; **ANTITRUST LAWS** 24 PAUL. E. PETERSON; RON ABEL SERV. 25 CENTER, INC.; JERRY'S SHELL SERV. CENTER, INC.; GULLERMO RAMIREZ; 26 LEOPOLOO RAMIREZ; NAZAR **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED** 27 SHEIBAINI; SITARA MANAGEMENT CORPORATION; TINSEL ENTERPRISES, 28 ENTERED ON ICMS INC.; QUANG TRUONG; and STEVEN F:\DOCUMENT\PLEADING\Shell-Texaco\2ndAmComplaint.shell.doc JAN 2 6 **2000**

-1-

RAY VEZERIAN, LOS FELIZ SHELL, i INC., NASSIM HANNA, 2 Plaintiffs, on behalf of 3 themselves and those similarly situated 5 v. 6 SAUDI REFINING, INC.; TEXACO, INC.; SHELL OIL COMPANY; MOTIVA ' ENTERPRISES LLC: EQUILON ENTERPRISES LLC; 8 EQUIVA TRADING COMPANY; and 9 EQUIVA SERVICES LLC, -10 Defendants. \mathbf{H} 12 I 13 INTRODUCTION 14 1. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and the approximately 23,000 15 Shell and Texaco branded dealers nationwide who operate or have operated Shell or Texaco 16 branded marketing premises and franchises throughout the United States and who have 17 purchased gasoline from Defendants MOTIVA ENTERPRISES LLC and/or EQUILON 18 ENTERPRISES LLC, or both, since January 1998 to the present time. 19 2. Plaintiffs bring this action against defendants Saudi Refining, Inc., Texaco, Inc., 20 Shell Oil Company, Equilon Enterprises LLC, Motive Enterprises LLC, Equiva Trading 21 Company and Equiva Services LLC, for damages and injunctive relief caused by reason of 22 defendants' violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. §1. Plaintiffs 23 demand a trial by jury of all issues triable thereby, and for their complaint, allege as follows: 24 H 25 **JURISDICTION** 26

3. This Court has jurisdiction over plaintiffs' Sherman Act claims pursuant to Sections 4 and 16 of the Clayton Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. §§15 and 26, and 28 U.S.C. §1337.

27

28

ĺ

Ш

PLAINTIFFS

4. The above-named plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of a class of persons similarly situated, are the following individuals and entities, who operate or have operated the following Shell or Texaco branded marketing premises and franchises at the following locations:

Plaintif	f's Name	Station	Leased		Station Location
		Brand	Marketin	ng	
			Premises		
			Yes/No		
Fouad N	N. Dagher	Shell	Y	'es	Dagher Shell #2
					916 Santa Anita
					Arcadia, CA 91006
Bisharat	·	Shell	Y	'es	Arcadia Shell Service
	ses, Inc.		•		25 East Foothill Boulevard
Smerpi					Arcadia, CA 91006
Tinsal F	Enterprises,	Shell	Ye	es	Victoria Shell
Inc.					2440 South Victoria
					Ventura, CA 93003
Alfred I	Buczkowski	Shell	Y	es	Oakview Shell
			_		905 North Ventura Avenue
	· ·				Oakview, CA 93022

1				
2	Los Feliz Shell,	Shell	Yes	Los Feliz Shell, Inc.
3	Inc.			3053 Los Feliz Boulevard
4				Los Angeles, CA 90039
5				
6	Nassim Hanna	Shell	Yes	Hanna Shell
7				1410 South Soto Street
8				Los Angeles, CA 90023
9				
10	Fouad N. Dagher	Shell	Yes	Dagher Shell #7
11				1401 South Garfield
12				Alhambra, CA 91803
13				
14	Esequiel Delgado	Shell	Yes	Delgado Shell Service
15				4357 East Brooklyn Avenue
16				Los Angeles, CA 90022
17				
18	Nasser El-Radi	Shell	Yes	Delamo Shell
19				5910 Dell
20				Lakewood, CA 90713
21				
22	Carlos Marquez	Shell	Yes	Marquez Shell #12
23				2600 Pellissier Place
24				Industry, CA 91746
25				
26	Fouad N. Dagher	Shell	Yes	Dagher Shell #5
27				5533 East Washington Blvd.
28				Commerce, CA 90040
	F::DOCUMENT\PLEADING	3\Shell-Texaco\2ndAmCo	mplaint.shell.doc	

Case 3:07-cv-04296-MJJ	Document 28-8	Filed 11/01/2007	Page 5 of 25

1				
2	Tinsal Enterprises,	Shell	Yes	N. Hill Shell
3	Inc.			16961 Devonshire Street
4				Granada Hills, CA 91344
5				
6	Fouad N. Dagher	Shell	Yes	Dagher Shell #10
7				1900 East Ceasar Chavez
8				Los Angeles, CA 90033
9				
10	Mahwash Farzaneh	Shell	Yes	Lawndale Shell
II				15808 South Inglewood
12				Lawndale, CA 90260
13				
14	Fouad N. Dagher	Shell	Yes	Dagher Shell #4
15				2219 Garfield
16				Monterey Park, CA 91754
17				
18	Nasser El-Radi	Shell	Yes	Shell 4U
19				430 Petrogrande
20				Monterey Park, CA 91754
21				
22	Carlos Marquez	Shell	Yes	Marquez Shell #7
23				3701 East Valley Boulevard
24				West Covina, CA 91744
26	M FIDE	Cl. II	37	ATD OL III
27	Nasser El-Radi	Shell	Yes	UR Shell
28				9305 East Firestone
20				Downey, CA 90241
	FADOCUMENT\PLEADING\	Shell-Texaco	2ndAmComplaint.shell.doc	
			-5-	

1				
2	G.G.&R Petroleum,	Shell	Yes	Holiday Shell Service
3	Inc.			800-M East Lugenia Avenue
4				Redlands, CA 92374
5				
6	H.J.F. Inc.	Shell	Yes	Simi Shell Food Mart
7				1120 East Los Angeles Avenue
8				Simi Valley, CA 93065-2802
9				
10	Kaleco, Co.	Shell	Yes	Camarillo Shell
11				1604 Ventura Boulevard
12				Camarillo, CA 93010
13				
14	Mike M. Madani	Texaco	No	South Bay Texaco
15				1700 Artesia Boulevard
16				Redondo Beach, CA 90278
17				
18	Quang Truong	Shell	Yes	Kathleen's Shell
19				4405 North Maine Avenue
20				Baldwin Park, CA 91706
21				
22	Fouad N. Dagher	Shell	Yes	Dagher Shell #13
23				8801 Lanewood
24				Downey, CA 90240
25		a	• •	N GL JI #12
26	Carlos Marquez	Shell	Yes	Marquez Shell #13 19910 Beach Boulevard
27				
28				La Mirada, CA 90638
	FADOCUMENT/PLEADING	G\Shell-Texaco\2ndAmC	omplaint.shell.doc	

1				
2				
3	Sami Merhi	Shell	Yes	Del Amo Shell
4				20225 South Avalon
5				Carson, CA 90745
6	Ctown Down	Cl II	V	Standa Shall Samiaa
7	Steven Ray	Shell	Yes	Steve's Shell Service
8	Vezerian			800 West Las Tunas Avenue
9				San Gabriel, CA 91776
10	67.111	a. II		W G
11	Guillermo	Shell	Yes	West Covina Shell
12	Ramierez			801 South Glendora Avenue
13				West Covina, CA 91790
14				
15	Edgardo R.	Shell	Yes	Gardy's Shell Service
16	Parungao			7511 East Rosecrans Avenue
17				Paramount, CA 90723
18				
19	Fouad N. Dagher	Shell	Yes	Dagher Shell #9
20				631 North Garfield
21				Monterey Park, CA 91754
22				
23	Sitara Management	Shell	Yes	Ventura/Shoup Shell
24	Corporation			22330 Ventura Boulevard
25				Woodland Hills, CA 91364
26				
27				
28				
	F:\DOCUMENT\PLEADING	\Shell-Texaco\2ndAmCa	omplaint.shell.doc	

2	Paul E. Peterson	Shell	Yes	West Torrance Shell
3				20805 South Anza Avenue
4				Torrance, CA 90503
5				
6	Ron Abel Serv.	Shell	Yes	Ron Abel's #2
7	Center, Inc.			21924 Devonshire Street
8				Chatsworth, CA 90311
9				
10	Jerry's Shell Serv.	Shell	Yes	Jerry's Shell
11	Center, Inc.			5161 Van Nuys Boulevard
12				Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
13				
14	Guillermo	Shell	Yes	Ramirez Shell Autocare
15	Ramirez			12004 East Ramona Boulevard
16				El Monte, CA 91732
17				
18	Leopoloo Ramirez	Shell	Yes	Ramirez Shell
19				3660 North Puente Avenue
20				Baldwin Park, CA 91706
21				
22	Nazar Sheibaini	Texaco	Yes	Camarillo Texaco
23				256 Carmen Drive
24				Camarillo, CA 93010
25				
26				
27				
28				
	FADOCUMENT\PLEADING	5\Shell-Texaco\2ndAi	nComplaint.shell.do	oc

5. Each individually named plaintiff is a resident of the state of California and the Central District of California.

Document 28-8

- 6. There are tens of thousands of individuals and/or entities, within the United States, too numerous to list every name in the case caption and, therefore, must be formed as a class in order to adequately litigate this action.
- 7. The representative Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the class generally. Plaintiffs, as named herein, share the exact same interests as the other members of the class and are able to fairly and adequately represent the interests of all members of the class.
- 8. The overall likelihood of individual Class Members prosecuting separate claims is remote at best. Individual members of the Class may or do not have a significant interest in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions and the impact of such a scenario upon the judicial system would be a tremendous waste of judicial resources and may cause a crippling effect. Additionally, the prosecution of separate actions by individual Class Members would create a risk of inconsistent and varying adjudications concerning the subject of this action, which adjudications could establish incompatible standards of conduct for defendants under the laws alleged herein.
- 9. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact among the Plaintiffs, as named herein, and the Class Members. Questions of law and fact common to the members of the aforesaid Class predominate over any questions which may affect only individual members, in that defendants have acted in a manner generally applicable to the entire Class.
- 10. Each corporate plaintiff is organized, exists, and doing business under the laws of the state of California, with its principal place of business located in the Central District of California.
- Each plaintiff who currently operates Shell branded marketing premises, at all times relevant herein, has been in a franchise relationship with Shell Oil Co. or its assignee Equilon Enterprises LLC, and since approximately January 1998 has purchased wholesale Shell branded gasoline from Equilon for resale to the general public.

4 5

6

9 10

8

П 12

> 13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

12. Each plaintiff who currently operates Texaco branded marketing premises, at all times relevant herein, has been in a franchise relationship with Texaco, Inc. or its assignee Equilon Enterprises LLC, and since approximately January 1998 has purchased wholesale Texaco branded gasoline from Equilon for resale to the general public.

IV

DEFENDANTS

Saudi Refining, Inc.

- 13. Defendant SAUDI REFINING, INC. ("Saudi") is a limited liability corporation with its headquarters and principal place of business in Houston, Texas. It is a corporate affiliate of Saudi Aramco, the state-owned oil company of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the principal member of OPEC, the international oil cartel.
- 14. Saudi is, and at all times relevant herein, has been directly or indirectly engaged in the business of exploring for and producing crude oil, transporting crude oil, and refining, transporting, storing, and marketing petroleum products, including gasoline, in the United States.
- Saudi, as part of Saudi Aramco, is one of the world's leading oil and natural gas 15. producers, with substantial manufacturing, transportation and marketing functions.
- 16. The Chairman of Saudi met with the Chairmen of Shell and Texaco for the purpose of forming and organizing a combination with Shell and Texaco in the refining and marketing of gasoline.
- The Chairman of Saudi knew and understood that the effect of the agreement 17. with Shell and Texaco would be the elimination of competition between and among Saudi, Texaco and Shell in the refining and marketing of gasoline in the United States.
- 18. The Chairman of Saudi knew and understood that the agreement with Shell and Texaco was an agreement among competitors to fix the price of gasoline sold to the independent Texaco and Shell retail dealers.
- 19. The Chairman of Saudi knew and understood that the agreement with Shell and Texaco was an agreement among competitors to divide markets in the United States.

ı	
2	

6 7

5

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

- 20. The Chairman of Saudi knew and understood that the agreement with Shell and Texaco was an agreement among competitors to divide customers in the United States.
- 21. Saudi in fact combined with Shell and Texaco to fix the price of gasoline sold to the independent Shell and Texaco retail dealers in the United States.
- Saudi in fact combined with Shell and Texaco to divide markets in the United 22. States.
- 23. Saudi in fact combined with Shell and Texaco to divide customers in the United States.

Shell Oil Co.

- 24. Defendant SHELL OIL COMPANY ("Shell") is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under the laws of the state of Delaware, with its headquarters and principal place of business at One Shell Plaza, Houston, Texas. Shell is a subsidiary of the Royal Dutch/Shell Group which is composed of Royal Dutch Petroleum Company (domiciled in the Netherlands) and The "Shell" Transport and Trading Company (domiciled in the United Kingdom).
- 25. Shell is, and at all times relevant herein, has been engaged in the business of exploring for and producing crude oil, transporting crude oil, and refining, transporting, storing, and marketing petroleum products, including gasoline, in the state of California and throughout the United States.
- 26. Shell, as part of Royal Dutch/Shell Group, is one of the world's leading oil and natural gas producers, with substantial manufacturing, transportation and marketing functions.
- 27. The Chairman of Shell met with the Chairmen of Saudi and Texaco for the purpose of forming and organizing a combination with Saudi and Texaco in the refining and marketing of gasoline.
- The Chairman of Shell knew and understood that the effect of the agreement 28. with Saudi and Texaco would be the elimination of competition between and among Saudi, Texaco and Shell in the refining and marketing of gasoline in the United States.

- 29. The Chairmen of Shell knew and understood that the agreement with Saudi and Texaco was an agreement among competitors to fix the price of gasoline sold to the independent Texaco and Shell retail dealers.
- 30. The Chairman of Shell knew and understood that the agreement with Saudi and Texaco was an agreement among competitors to divide markets in the United States.
- 31. The Chairman of Shell knew and understood that the agreement with Saudi and Texaco was an agreement among competitors to divide customers in the United States.
- 32. Shell in fact combined with Saudi and Texaco to fix the price of gasoline sold to the independent Shell and Texaco retail dealers in the United States.
- 33. Shell in fact combined with Saudi and Texaco to divide markets in the United States.
- 34. Shell in fact combined with Saudi and Texaco to divide customers in the United States.

Texaco, Inc.

- 35. Defendant, TEXACO, INC. ("Texaco") is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under the laws of the state of Delaware, with its headquarters and principal place of business at 2000 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, New York.
- 36. Texaco is, and at all times relevant herein, has been engaged in the business of exploring for and producing crude oil, transporting crude oil, and refining, transporting, storing, and marketing petroleum products, including gasoline, in the State of California and throughout the United States.
- 37. Texaco is one of the world's leading oil and natural gas producers, with substantial manufacturing, transportation and marketing functions.
- 38. The Chairman of Texaco met with the Chairmen of Saudi and Shell for the purpose of forming and organizing a combination with Saudi and Texaco Shell in the refining and marketing of gasoline.

- 39. The Chairman of Texaco knew and understood that the effect of the agreement with Saudi and Shell would be the elimination of competition between and among Saudi, Texaco and Shell in the refining and marketing of gasoline in the United States.
- 40. The Chairmen of Texaco knew and understood that the agreement with Saudi and Shell was an agreement among competitors to fix the price of gasoline sold to the independent Texaco and Shell retail dealers.
- 41. The Chairman of Texaco knew and understood that the agreement with Saudi and Shell was an agreement among competitors to divide markets in the United States.
- 42. The Chairman of Texaco knew and understood that the agreement with Saudi and Shell was an agreement among competitors to divide customers in the United States.
- 43. Texaco in fact combined with Saudi and Shell to fix the price of gasoline sold to the independent Shell and Texaco retail dealers in the United States.
- 44. Texaco in fact combined with Saudi and Shell to divide markets in the United States.
- 45. Texaco in fact combined with Saudi and Shell to divide customers in the United States.

Equilon Enterprises LLC

- 46. Defendant EQUILON ENTERPRISES LLC ("Equilon") is a limited liability corporation with its headquarters and principal place of business in Houston, Texas.
- 47. Equilon is a combination between Texaco and Shell that combines their western and mid-western refining, transportation, terminal (storage), and marketing operations and assets. Shell owns 56 percent of Equilon, and Texaco owns the other 44 percent.
- 48. Equilon began operating during January 1998. Since that time, it has been in the business of refining, transporting, storing, and marketing petroleum products, including gasoline, in the state of California and other western and mid-western states.
- 49. Equilon refines and markets gasoline and other petroleum products under both the Shell and Texaco brand names in all or parts of 32 states, selling products to 9,002 Shell and Texaco retail outlets.

6

11 12

13 1.1

15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23 21

25 26

27 28

- 50. Equilon is the fourth largest retail gasoline marketer and the fourth largest refiner in the United States.
 - 51. Equilon's annual gross revenue is approximately \$22 billion.
- 52. Equilon is number one in market share in Oregon, Arizona, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Missouri, Arkansas and Kentucky. Equilon is number two in market share in Alaska, Hawaii, California, Nevada, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Indiana and Illinois.
- 53. Equilon has seven refineries, refining approximately 846,000 barrels per day. Equilon owns 76 terminals for crude oil and refined products in the United States.
- 54. Equilon owns an interest, with its competitors, in 45,600 miles of pipeline throughout the United States.
- 55. Equilon is a combination, in the form of a trust or otherwise, used by Shell and Texaco to fix the price of gasoline sole to the independent Shell and Texaco retail dealers in the western and midwestern states of the United States.

Motiva Enterprises LLC

- 56. Defendant MOTIVA ENTERPRISES LLC ("Motiva") is a limited liability corporation with its headquarters and principal place of business in Houston, Texas.
- 57. Motiva is a combination between Texaco, Saudi, and Shell that combines their castern United States and Gulf Coast refining, transportation, terminal (storage), and marketing operations and assets. Shell owns 35 percent of Motiva, and Texaco and Saudi each own 32.5 percent.
- Motiva began operations during July 1998. Since that time, Motiva has been in 58. the business of refining, transporting, storing, and marketing petroleum products, including gasoline, in the Gulf Coast and eastern United States.
- 59. Motiva refines and markets gasoline under the Shell and Texaco brand names in 27 states of the United States, selling products to 13,900 Shell and Texaco retail outlets.
- 60. Motive is the second largest retail gasoline marketer and the eighth largest refiner in the United States.

I

2

- 6

4

- 7 8
- 9 10

П

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

26

25

28

27

- 61. Motiva's annual gross revenue is approximately \$11 billion.
- 62. Motiva is number one in market share in Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Florida, North Carolina, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Maryland and Delaware.
- Motiva is number two in market share in Georgia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New 63. Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts and Connecticut.
- 64. Motiva has four refineries, refining approximately 819,000 barrels per day. Motiva has 50 terminals for crude oil and refined products in the United States.
- 65. Motiva is a combination, in the form of a trust or otherwise, used by Saudi, Texaco and Shell to fix the price of gasoline sold to the independent Shell and Texaco retail dealers in the eastern and Gulf coast states of the United States.

Equiva Trading Co.

- 66. Defendant EOUIVA TRADING COMPANY ("Equiva Trading") is a general partnership headquartered in Houston, Texas, with offices in Universal City and Burbank, California; and Calgary, Canada.
- Equilon and Motiva are the general partners in Equiva Trading, each having a 50 67. percent interest. Equiva Trading became operational in July 1998 and provides supply and trading services to Equilon, Motiva and affiliates of Texaco and Shell.
- 68. Equiva Trading was formed with the purpose and effect of eliminating competition in the supply and trading services to the Equilon and Motiva combines, and to the affiliates of Saudi, Texaco and Shell.

Equiva Services LLC

- 69. Defendant EQUIVA SERVICES LLC ("Equiva Services") is a limited liability corporation with its headquarters and principal place of business in Houston, Texas.
- 70. Equiva Services is 50 percent owned by Equilon and 50 percent owned by Motiva. It began operations in July 1998, and provides economic and business research, facilities management, financial, human resources, information technology, legal, marketing, and safety, health and environmental services for Equilon and Motiva.

ı

3 4

8

q

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

71. Equiva Services was formed with the purpose and effect of eliminating competition in services provided to the Equilon and Motiva combines, and to the affiliates of Saudi, Texaco and Shell.

\mathbf{V}

CO-CONSPIRATORS

72. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that persons whose identities are at this time unknown have engaged with defendants in the violations alleged herein. Plaintiffs may at a later time amend this complaint to add said unknown co-conspirators as defendants when and if they become known.

VI

THE SHELL/TEXACO/SAUDI COMBINATIONS

- 73. In or about October 1996, at a place and time unknown to plaintiffs, Saudi, Shell and Texaco met and entered into an agreement to raise, fix, peg, and stabilize prices.
- 74. In or about October 1996, Saudi, Shell and Texaco formed their combinations, combining their refining, transportation, terminal (storage), and marketing operations and assets in the United States.
- 75. On or about March 1997, Shell and Texaco entered into a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the formation of a combination to be known as "Westco," which later was renamed "Equilon." Westco was to be organized as a limited liability corporation into which Texaco and Shell would contribute their refining, transportation, terminal (storage), and marketing operations and assets in the western and mid-western United States (roughly corresponding with Petroleum Administration for Defense Districts ("PADDs") II, IV, and V).
- On or about July 16, 1997, Shell, Texaco, and Saudi entered into a 76. Memorandum of Understanding regarding the formation of a combination to be called "Eastco," which later was renamed "Motiva." Eastco was to be organized as a limited liability corporation into which Saudi, Shell, and Texaco would contribute their refining, transportation, terminal (storage), and marketing operations and assets in the Gulf Coast and eastern United States (roughly corresponding to PADDs I and III).

8

14

15

13

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

- 77. At some point during or after January 1998, Texaco and Shell sold, transferred or assigned to Equilon (formerly Westco) their interests in the marketing premises leased to plaintiffs, as well as their interests in and obligations under each plaintiff's franchise agreements.
- 78. With regard to those plaintiffs that operate leased marketing premises, prior to and after transferring those premises to Equilon, neither Shell nor Texaco made bona fide offers to sell, transfer, or assign their interests in the premises to plaintiffs.
- 79. Equilon was formed for the purpose and with the effect of eliminating competition between and among Saudi, Texaco and Shell in the refining and marketing of gasoline in the United States.
- 80. One of the purposes of Shell and Texaco in forming Equilon was to fix prices between themselves on gasoline sold to the independent Shell and Texaco branded dealers.
- 81. Shell and Texaco agreed that Equilon would fix the price at which gasoline is sold to the independent Shell and Texaco branded dealers in the western and mid-western states of the United States.
- 82. Equilon fixes the price at which gasoline is sold to the independent Shell and Texaco branded dealers in the western and mid-western states of the United States.
- 83. Motiva was formed for the purpose and with the effect of eliminating competition between and among Saudi, Texaco and Shell in the refining and marketing of gasoline in the United States.
- 84. One of the purposes of Saudi, Shell and Texaco in forming Motiva was to fix prices between and among themselves on gasoline sold to the independent Shell and Texaco branded dealers.
- 85. Saudi, Shell and Texaco agreed that Motiva would fix the price at which gasoline is sold to the independent Shell and Texaco branded dealers in the Gulf and east coast states of the United States.
- Motiva fixes the price at which gasoline is sold to the independent Shell and 86. Texaco branded dealers in the Gulf and east coast states of the United States.

l

2 3

4 5

8

6

9 10

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28 VII

TRADE AND COMMERCE

- 87. The exploration, production, transportation, storage, refining, distribution, marketing, and selling of crude oil and gasoline is carried on in and substantially affects interstate and foreign commerce, and that the combination and conspiracy among and between Saudi, Texaco, and Shell, to fix the price of gasoline sold to retail dealers substantially affects, impedes, and unreasonably restrains the free flow of crude oil and gasoline between and among the various states of the United States, and foreign countries and the United States.
- 88. Entry into the refining and marketing of gasoline is difficult and would not be timely, likely, or sufficient to prevent anticompetitive effects in those markets.
- 89. By reason of the violations alleged herein, plaintiffs have paid and continue to pay higher wholesale prices for branded gasoline than they would in a free and competitive market.
- 90. Since the launch of the Equilon combination, wholesale and retail prices of gasoline sold in the state of California have increased substantially.
- During that same period, total statewide refinery production and inventories of 91. gasoline rose compared to the same period in the previous year, refinery margins increased, and crude oil prices decreased.
- 92. Beginning at least during the last two years, crude oil prices, when adjusted for inflation, dropped to their lowest levels since the Great Depression of the 1930's.
- 93. During the time that crude oil prices were dropping to their lowest levels since the Great Depression, Saudi, Shell and Texaco, by and through Equilon and Motiva, agreed to and did in fact fix and raise the price of gasoline sold to the independent Shell and Texaco branded retail dealers.
- Before Equilon and Motiva were formed, Saudi, Texaco and Shell were actual 94. competitors.
- 95. Saudi, Shell and Texaco combined and conspired to form Motiva and Equilon as the means to fix prices on gasoline sold to the independent Shell and Texaco retail dealers.

- 96. Saudi, Shell and Texaco combined and conspired to form Motiva and Equilon as the means to divide markets and customers.
 - 97. Saudi, Shell and Texaco did what they combined and conspired to do.
- 98. Motiva and Equilon combined, conspired and contracted to fix the price of gasoline sold to the independent Texaco and Shell dealers in the United States.
- 99. Motiva and Equilon combined, conspired and contracted to divide the markets in the United States.
- Motiva and Equilon combined, conspired and contracted to divide customers in 100. the United States.
 - Motiva and Equilon, as a combination, do the following: 101.
 - Market gasoline in all 50 states of the United States under both the Shell (a) and Texaco brand names;
 - (b) Rank number one in national market share for branded gasoline, refining capacity and lubricant sales;
 - Have annual gross revenue of approximately \$33 billion; (c)
 - Provide product to 22.903 Texaco and Shell branded retail outlets; (d)
 - Own 11 refineries with a total refining capacity of 1,665,270 barrels per (e) day;
 - Own or have an interest in 126 crude oil and product terminals; and (f)
 - Have ownership interests with their competitors in 45,600 miles of (g) pipeline.
- 102. By reason of the combination and conspiracy among Saudi, Texaco and Shell to fix prices by and through their combinations, Equilon and Motiva, independent Shell and Texaco branded retailers paid more for their gasoline than they would have in a free and competitive market.
- 103. After acquiring plaintiffs' marketing premises and franchise agreements from Shell and Texaco, Equilon also imposed substantial rent increases upon each plaintiff operating leased marketing premises.

103. After acquiring plaintiffs' marketing premises and franchise agreements from
Shell and Texaco, Equilon also imposed substantial rent increases upon each plaintiff operating
leased marketing premises. In particular, prior to forming Equilon, both Shell and Texaco
offered variable rent programs, pursuant to which a dealer selling a specified amount of
gasoline received a per gallon rebate or credit against station rent, and thereby a reduction in
gasoline prices. After forming Equilon, acting in concert through Equilon, Shell and Texaco
effectively eliminated their variable rent programs, so as to increase the price of gasoline to
Shell and Texaco dealers. The foregoing conduct of defendants was an effort to coerce Shell
and Texaco dealers to agree to raise the retail price of gasoline, and was part and in furtherance
of defendants' agreement, combination, and conspiracy to fix, raise, stabilize, and peg the price
of gasoline sold to Shell and Texaco dealers.

- deprived of an opportunity to acquire such premises. Franchisee ownership of marketing premises, as opposed to leasing such premises from a franchisor, substantially increases the value of a gasoline station business because it gives the owner-franchisee the freedom to negotiate arms length franchise agreements or supply contracts with any oil company franchisor on much better terms for the franchisee.
- 105. By reason of the violations alleged herein, plaintiffs and all persons similarly situated have sustained injury to their businesses and property in amounts yet to be ascertained, but including the loss of sales, profits, and business goodwill, increased rent, increased prices paid to defendants for gasoline and other petroleum products, the value of their businesses as going concerns, the increased costs of doing business, including any debts incurred.
- 106. Prior to the Equilon and other combinations outline above, Shell and Texaco were actual competitors.

ENDOCUMENT\PLEADING\Shell-Texaco\2ndAmComplaint.shell.doc

l

2 3

4

7

5

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

VIII

SECTION 1 OF THE SHERMAN ACT

- 107. Each of the Equilon and Motiva combinations described hereinabove constitutes a contract, combination or conspiracy by Saudi, Shell and Texaco to raise, fix, peg, or stabilize prices in per se violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 1.
- The Equilon and Motiva combinations constitute contracts, combinations or conspiracies between and among defendants, Saudi, Texaco, Shell, Equilon, Motiva, Equiva Trading and Equiva Services, to raise, fix, peg, or stabilize prices in per se violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. Sec. 1.
- 109. Each Chairman of Saudi, Texaco and Shell know of and approved of the price fixing agreement.
- 110. The Equilon and Motiva combinations constitute contracts, combinations or conspiracies between and among defendants, Saudi, Texaco, Shell, Equilon, Motiva, Equiva Trading and Equiva Services, to divide markets in per se violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 1.
- 111. Each Chairman of Saudi, Texaco and Shell know of and approved of the agreement to divide markets.
- The Equilon and Motiva combinations constitute contracts, combinations or conspiracies between and among defendants, Saudi, Texaco, Shell, Equilon, Motiva, Equiva Trading and Equiva Services, to divide customers in per se violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antirust Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 1.
- Each Chairman of Saudi, Texaco and Shell knew of and approved of the 113. agreement to divide customers.
- The overall conduct of defendants described above also constitutes a contract, 114. combination or conspiracy to raise, fix, peg, or stabilize prices in per se violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. Sect. 1.

ı

2 3

4 5

6

8

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

IX

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all persons similarly situated pray for relief as follows:

- that the court adjudge and decree the instant action as a Class Action: (a)
- (b) that the jury find and this Court adjudge and decree that defendants have violated Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. Sec. 1;
- (c) that plaintiffs and Class Members recover actual damages as the jury shall find them to have sustained and that the damages be trebled pursuant to Section 4 of the Clayton Act;
- (d) that the Court issue a permanent injunction dissolving Equilon, Motiva, Equiva Trading, and Equiva Services pursuant to Section 16 of the Clayton Act;
- that the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining and prohibiting defendants (e) from contracting, combining, and conspiring to raise, fix, peg, or stabilize prices;
- (f) that the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining and prohibiting defendants from contracting, combining, and conspiring to fix plaintiffs' rents at artificially high and noncompetitive levels:
- (g) that the Court issue a permanent injunction requiring defendants to allow any dealer to rebrand, without any penalty;
- (h) for a complete list of the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the persons and/or entities who were and/or are a Shell and/or Texaco branded dealer nationwide who operate or have operated Shell or Texaco branded marketing premises and franchises throughout the United States and of those persons or entities who has purchased gasoline from Defendants MOTIVA ENTERPRISES LLC and/or EQUILON ENTERPRISES LLC, or both since January 1998 to the present time.
- that the Court award plaintiffs their costs of suit herein, including reasonable (i) attorneys' fees pursuant to Section 4 of the Clayton Act; and

1	(j) that the Court award plaintiffs and Class Members such other and further relief
2	as it shall deem just and appropriate.
3	
4	
5	Dated: 2, 2000 ALIOTO LAW FIRM SHULMAN, WALCOTT & SHULMAN, P.A. LAW OFFICE OF JOHN H. BOONE
7	BLEAU, FOX & ASSOCIATES, A.P.C.
8	
9	
10	By: Joseph M. Alioto, Esq.
11	Joseph W. Miloto, Esq.
12	DEMAND FOR JURY
13	
14	NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the plaintiffs in the above-entitled First-Second
15	Amended action demand a trial by jury in the above-entitled action.
16 17	Dated: 24, 2000 ALIOTO LAW FIRM SHULMAN, WALCOTT & SHULMAN, P.A.
18	LAW OFFICE OF JOHN H. BOONE BLEAU, FOX & ASSOCIATES, A.P.C.
19	
20	
21	By: Rota Tes
22	Joseph M. Alioto, Esq.
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
• •	

2 3	Joseph M. Alioto ALIOTO LAW FIRM One Embarcadero Center Suite 4000 San Francisco, CA 94111-3607 Telephone: 415-434-8900	
4 5 6 7	Daniel R. Shulman Terry M. Walcott SHULMAN, WALCOTT & SHULMAN, P.A. 121 West Franklin Avenue Minneapolis, MN 55404 Telephone: 612-871-2909	
8 9 10	John H. Boone LAW OFFICE OF JOHN H. BOONE One Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: 415-434-1133	
11 12 13	Thomas P. Bleau BLEAU, FOX & ASSOCIATES 3575 Cahuenga Blvd., West, Suite 580 Los Angeles, CA 90068 Telephone :(323) 874-8613	
14	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
15		
16	UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT
17	CENTRAL DISTR	LICT OF CALIFORNIA
18	Fouad N. Dagher; et al.,	CLASS ACTION
19 20	Plaintiffs, vs.	CASE NO: CV-99-06114 GHK (JWJx)
21	Saudi Refining, Inc.; et al.,	AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE
22	Defendants.	
23	Defendants.	
24	Gayle M. Schaub, being first duly swor	n, deposes and says on oath that she is employed
25	in the office of an attorney permitted to practic	e <u>pro hac vice</u> before this Court in the above-
26	entitled action, and that on the 24th day of Janu	uary, 2000, at the discretion of said attorney, she
27	served a true and correct copy of SECOND AN	MENDED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
28		

f\\document\pleading\shell-texaco\aos1 shell.doc

AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF UNDER THE ANTITRUST LAWS by arranging for the deposit of same with Federal Express, in the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota, upon: 2 3 4 For Defendant Saudi Refining, Inc. 5 Bryan A. Merryman Thomas J. O'Sullivan WHITE & CASE LLP Michael S. Shuster 6 633 West Fifth Street WHITE & CASE LLP 19th Floor 1155 Avenue of the Americas Los Angeles, CA 90071 New York, NY 10036 8 9 For Defendant Texaco, Inc. 10 Thomas J. Nolan Alan M. Grimaldi 11 Dale J. Giali Patricia G. Butler 12 **HOWREY & SIMON HOWREY & SIMON** 550 South Hope Street 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. 13 **Suite 1400** Washington, D.C. 20004 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2627 14 15 For Defendant Shell Oil Company 16 Ronald L. Olson 17 Bradley S. Phillips William D. Temko 18 Stuart N. Senator 19 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON, LLP 355 South Grand Avenue 20 35th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560 21 Le M. Schrub le M. Schaub 22 23 24 Subscribed and sworn to before me 25 this 24th day of January, 2000. 26 27 **Notary Public** 28

f:\document\pleading\she